

THE

CHRISTIAN DISCIPLE.

No. 10.

OCTOBER, 1817.

Vol. V.

OBSERVATIONS ON CONTROVERSY.

CONTROVERSY results from discordant opinions and clashing interests. The causes of difference in opinion are innumerable; and considering the diversity in mental powers among mankind, the different modes of education and the prepossessions unavoidably contracted, we have no reason to hope for a perfect agreement in this probationary state.

Whether such an agreement in opinion will be experienced in heaven is a question, which we are unable to decide. If the friends of God shall enter the heavenly world with a diversity of intellectual powers and different degrees of knowledge, and shall there be in a state of progressive improvement, it is difficult to conceive how they can ever be in all respects united in opinion; and it is possible, that controversy may be one of the means, by which the saints in glory will advance in knowledge. But this may be expected, that difference of opinion will not, in that state, be inconsistent with unity of affection, or the most perfect friendship and happiness. And that controversy, if

it shall be known in heaven, will be conducted with such feelings, and on such principles, as to be the occasion of improvement in knowledge, in love and in blessedness. Such ought to be the case in this world, and such it would be, if all men were truly wise and humble. But such is the pride, the folly, the selfconfidence and uncharitableness, with which controversies are managed, that the most trivial differences of opinion become occasions of mutual alienation, censure and reproach.

Perhaps there is nothing, by which Christianity has been more injured than by the disingenuous and unchristian manner, in which controversies have been managed. As though it were not a sufficient misfortune for a man to be in error, or supposed to be in error, he is reproached and punished for his honest belief, if he happens to dissent from a popular doctrine. Whether the doctrine be true or false, sense or nonsense, or whether he be really in error or not, it makes no kind of difference as to the punishment inflicted. Those on the popular side have commonly such a

share of self confidence, that they can unsparingly censure such, as depart from their creed—and this without the trouble of humble inquiry or careful examination.

Controversies on civil, political and religious subjects, have been managed in a similar manner. Respecting property, controversies often arise on trivial grounds. By altercation the passions of the parties become agitated; subjects, foreign to that which occasioned the dispute are introduced and blended; the relations and friends on each side become interested, and soon there is occasion to exclaim, "Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth!"

A political controversy may arise when the difference of opinion would be of little consequence if managed with candour; but from the want of candour or from interested motives the bubble is blown up to the size of a mountain, and filled with malignity; then, by bursting, it may overwhelm a whole community. Perhaps in the outset both parties aim at the same end, but differ as to the best means or instruments to be employed. In the course of the controversy the original question may be forgotten, and twenty others substituted to keep alive the animosity. Through the influence of party spirit the public good is too frequently overlooked. Instead of doing all they can to become united the leaders often do what they can to widen the breach, and to prevent reconciliation.

Happy it might have been for the world if such management had been confined to political

controversies. But to the dishonour of the Christian name, what has been called *religious* controversy has too generally been conducted with *irreligious* passions. At the beginning of a dispute there may have been but one question, and that perhaps of a very unimportant character; but this has been so managed as to beget many others; by multiplying the topics of debate the original question perhaps loses its importance and others are substituted as fuel for the fire of contention. After some time each party assumes some distinguishing name, or has one given by its opponents. That name which happens to become popular will be assumed by multitudes, who are wholly unqualified to judge of the points in debate, and whose real opinions are very different from those of the man, whom they fondly call *Rabbi*. The tenets or the system first distinguished by his name may be modified and in a great measure changed; some articles may be varied, some expunged and others of an opposite character substituted, and still the system is regarded as essentially the same. By thus amending or revolutionizing the system, it sometimes so happens, that what had been regarded as heresy is adopted for orthodoxy, and what had been orthodoxy, is denounced as heresy.

From Calvin and Arminius were derived the names Calvinists and Arminians. In former ages the Calvinistic system embraced, as essential, the following ideas:—

That the sin of Adam was imputed to all his posterity, and

that they indeed "sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression" That by the fall man lost his power of obeying, but God retained his right of commanding: That Christ suffered for an elect number only—that he died to appease the anger of God and reconcile him to the sinner—that the sins of the elect were imputed to Christ, and that he paid their debt to divine justice: That believers are justified and accounted as righteous "only for the righteousness of Christ imput to them."

The Arminian system rejected all these articles and embraced opposite opinions. Yet is it not a well known fact, that a large portion of the clergy of New-England, who claim the honours of Calvinism, are in all these particulars dissenters from the doctrines of Calvin, and from the Westminster Assembly? Is it not also well known that these professed Calvinists are, in respect to these articles, the followers of Arminius rather than of Calvin?

But why, it may be asked, is this inconsistency exposed? To this we may answer—It is done that readers may be led to reflect on the mutable character of what has been called orthodoxy, to consider the fallibility of all men, the danger of being governed by party names and party spirit, and the importance of learning to think for themselves in matters of faith and religion.

"The world is governed by names." This borrowed remark is just, both in regard to politics and religion. Nothing perhaps has had a more pernicious

influence in disturbing the peace of mankind, and in preventing the progress of truth, than the idolatrous respect which has been paid to popular names. There is indeed a degree of respect due to the characters and writings of great and good men. But it should be better understood that all great and good men have been liable to err, and that great and good men are not peculiar to any denomination of Christians.

In regard to politics the spirit of party seems in a great measure to have subsided in our land; and it should be the care of every Christian to do all he can to prevent the resurrection of a monster so malignant and so injurious to the peace and welfare of society. It should also be the care of every Christian to do all he can to eradicate from his own mind and from the minds of others the spirit of party in regard to religion, and to cultivate those friendly sentiments and affections which are the essence of that love or charity which is the "end of the commandment," the glory of Christianity, and the object of divine approbation; and without which all other attainments will "profit us nothing" in the final account.

As differences and changes in opinion are to be expected, and as these will give rise to disputation, it should be the aim of Christians to effect a reformation in the manner of conducting controversies. Let every man feel his own fallibility and his need of candour both from God and man. Let these truths be duly impressed on every mind,—that all the advances

which have been made from the darkness of popery and even from paganism, have been reproached as dangerous innovations; that hitherto there has been but little opportunity for free or impartial inquiry, on account of the perils which have ever accompanied a dissent from popular opinions; and, consequently, that it is highly probable that Christians of every name are in some great errors. Let all bitterness, wrath and clamor and all evil speaking be excluded; let the language of controversy be kind, respectful and conciliating; let love be without dissimulation; let every writer be open to conviction, and aim to do good to his oppo-

nent and to community by a thorough investigation and fair display of the truth. On the one hand, let no man imagine that his being on the side of the majority is the least evidence that he is on the side of truth; on the other, let no man suppose that his having changed his opinions is any proof that his present views are correct. Let all Christians learn to estimate their own characters and the characters of each other, not by a human creed, but by the precepts of our Lord, the laws of righteousness, love and peace. With these views and on these principles controversy may be productive of great and durable benefits.

ON THE TESTIMONY OF JUDAS.

To the declaration of Judas, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood," we would call the attention of more modern infidelity. Repulse us not with the contemptuous answer of the high priests, "what is that to us?" Let the descendants of those ancient priests,—let the despised, dispersed, and persecuted nation who cried out in their fury, "His blood be upon us and on our children," answer what it has been to *them*; and we will show what it is to *others*.

This testimony of Judas we propose now to consider in its peculiar nature, value, and application.

1. *It is the testimony of an enemy.* It has been suggested, and with great probability, that Judas was intended by his employers to have acted a princi-

pal part in the trial of Jesus, had not his premature and unexpected repentance defeated the design. Jesus was accused of pretences to the Messiahship, and represented to Pilate as one who had been saluted by the people with the title of king, a man who was drawing after him multitudes of an inconstant people, and who therefore might be dangerous to the Roman power. The High Priests thought no doubt that they should avail themselves of the testimony of this perjured disciple, and that he would be a principal and important witness, whose testimony would be the more readily received because he had belonged to the intimate associates of the accused. But the bitter repentance and awful death of the traitor, as soon as the mock trial

had been completed in the council of the priests, deprived these miscreants of the man whom they had expected still farther to employ, and they were compelled to suborn witnesses as they could, whose testimony was found to be utterly inadequate. When Jesus is standing before Pilate, who was waiting for some substantial accusation, and inquiring repeatedly, what evil hath he done, why does not Judas appear and publish the crimes for which he had assisted in apprehending him? Ah! the traitor has already gone to appear himself before a bar more terrible than Pilate's. If, when he had delivered up his Master, he could have produced the most insignificant charge, would he not have hastened to communicate it to the delighted ear of Caiaphas? After his treachery had succeeded, when Jesus had surrendered himself without resistance, when he had nothing to fear from the dispersed and timid band of the disciples, was this the time for him to repent of his successful malignity? Would he not rather have attempted to recollect something in the character and conduct of Jesus to extenuate his own baseness; and would not the thinnest shadow of fault appearing in the life of Jesus, have mitigated the intolerable anguish of that remorse which at last hurried him to destruction? But no! Judas, who was expected to appear with his accusations, is himself torn by the scourges of his conscience. The traitor trembles in his retreat, and dies in horrible anguish with a testimony to the

innocence of his Master on his lips!

2. The testimony of Judas to the innocence of Jesus is *the testimony of a disciple*. Judas, before he conceived his base design was admitted to the same intimacy with his Master as the other members of the little fraternity of disciples. He had listened to the most confidential conversations. He had been entrusted with the commission of an apostle. He had attended his Master whenever he retired from the troublesome concourse of promiscuous followers. Nothing which the other disciples knew of their Master could have been concealed from Judas. He had been present at his miracles. He had himself, perhaps, been furnished with a share of miraculous powers. If in these wonderful works, which, if real, proved that God was indeed with Jesus, there had been any collusion with the disciples, Judas was a party, and could now bring to light the fraud, and expose the pretensions of the boasted wonder-worker. If there had been any concealed ambition, or defect of honesty or ingenuousness in our Lord's designs, Judas was in his confidence. Nay, if an unguarded expression had ever escaped the lips of Jesus, the traitor was listening and ready to record it. But with all these opportunities of detection and cavil, he found nothing, absolutely nothing. He dies without leaving a suspicion which might veil the disinterestedness of his malice; and his past intimacy with the holy Jesus served but to aggravate the re-

remorse which preyed upon his mind. He shrunk from the task of accusation, though he had been hurried by his resentment to the crime of treachery. He had nought whereof to accuse his Master ; and bore his last attestation to the innocence in which the closest intimacy could discover no stain, nor prying malignity detect a cause for imputation of defect.

3 *It is the testimony of a dying man.* It is preceded by his repentance, and sealed with his death. Think of the situation of Judas, and you may conceive how impressive must have been that conviction of the innocence of Jesus, which, in circumstances like these, could so harrow up his conscience. The person whom he had been instrumental in arraigning was condemned. Judas had every prospect of favour and consideration with the rulers of the Jews. He had reason to expect that his accusations, if successful, would be rewarded with wealth or office. He had performed a service, which, to a sordid and worldly mind like his, promised every thing which he could desire. The cause of the Saviour was desperate ; the cause of his enemies was triumphant ; and Judas was the leader, and his claims were pre-eminent. In this situation of security and hope, he is the

most wretched of men. Without hesitation, even without a parley with his accusing conscience, he goes and throws down in horror the wages of his treachery at the feet of his employers, and dies writhing with remorse. What an homage is this to the innocence of Jesus ! He rushes involuntarily into the presence of his Judge. He flies, black with his crime, into the very light of God's indignation, into the court of eternal retribution, where his silence can no longer suppress the truth of facts, where treachery recoils in vengeance on the traitor, where the judgements of iniquity are reversed, and the accusation of malignity is beaten back upon the accuser. He cannot live even in a region of murderers and traitors like himself. He cannot endure the society of the very men whose designs he had accomplished. Humiliation and terror, and remorse and despair lash him out of life. Under the scourge of such a conscience he leaves his testimony to the innocence of Jesus ; and if we find it not here, where shall we look for sincerity ? Go wretched and wicked man ! Go with your crimes upon your head ! You have left us your testimony that you sinned in that you betrayed the innocent blood,—and it is enough ! B.

EXTRACT FROM WILLIAM HAY, ESQ.

MR. EDITOR,

I TAKE the liberty to send you an extract, which, if it be found worthy of a place in "the Christian Disciple," is much at

your service. It is made from a work, entitled "Religio Philosophi: or the principles of morality and christianity illustrated from a view of the uni-

verse, and of man's situation in it, by William Hay, Esq."* To me it appears well adapted to administer seasonable instruction and warning to the men of this generation :—

"Attempting a uniformity in opinion breeds dissension : permitting a latitude in opinion begets unity. Men will either not think of religion at all, or they will think for themselves. They can do no otherwise ; for their particular ideas arise from the impression of objects on their minds ; which objects are seen by different men in different lights, and under different circumstances : and it was as much the intention of Providence, that there should be a difference of opinions, as of persons : nor is it to be imagined, that God, who so formed man, is offended by such difference of opinion on any subject.

"It is a vain attempt to think of making men agree in any one religion, by forbidding them to examine into the principles of it. Nay, it makes it impossible for them to be of that religion, notwithstanding they profess it ; or however they may comply with outward forms, from fashion, from deference to authority, or from fear of punishment : for religion must arise from an inward conviction ; and there can be no conviction, without examination, and weighing the reasons for, and against it.

"It is as vain to think of forcing men into religion by attacking their persons or reputation. Persecution may make good men martyrs, and bad ones hypocrites ; but can never make

any man religious : for neither blows nor calumny are proper arguments of conviction.

"It is as vain too, to think of preserving such a uniformity by men's setting up their own decisions for a guide ; calling themselves orthodox, and the rest of the world heretics ; making it meritorious in a man to follow their opinions blindfold, and criminal in him, after his best examination, to follow his own. If private men differ with public decisions, what wonder ? when these decisions have often differed with one another : Popes have condemned popes, and councils, councils ; travelling the world over to settle points, some inexplicable, and others frivolous ; and taking great pains to make themselves ridiculous : which must always be the case, when man's judgment mixed with his interests, passions, and infirmities, is set up as a standard of faith, instead of the scriptures.

"It was commendable in the Bereans to examine the scriptures, which require that every one should be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in him. And it is vain to think of establishing the authority of scripture, without leaving men at liberty to examine the external and internal evidence of the truth of it. A man cannot believe it to be true, without some reason for his belief : and it is not a good reason, because another either does, or says he believes it. Nor can he believe any part of it, that he thinks repugnant to reason, the only rule,† by which he can judge of

* Page 222—226, London edition, 1753.

† Reason is rather the *only faculty*, than the "*only rule*" by which he can

it: he is sure that whatever is repugnant to right reason, could not be delivered by men commissioned and inspired of God.

"It is vain to endeavour to stop a free inquiry into the grounds of religion; it makes men more eager after such inquiries. It is also imprudent; it hurts both religion and the clergy; for men are apt to suspect a cause, that is not suffered to come to trial, as well as the advocates for it. If it be true, why are they against bringing it to the test? If it be false, why should they impose it? If it be doubtful, why are they angry with those that doubt? Truth will bear the light; and the more it is exposed to it, the brighter it will appear. It is certain that nothing has done more prejudice to Christianity, than the trying to deter men from such inquiries, by branding them with opprobrious names, by inflaming others against them, and by alarming them with the danger of listen-

judge of it." We may be "sure that whatever is repugnant to right reason could not be delivered by men commissioned by God;" yet it should be remembered, that through the influence of prejudice or other causes, the minds of men may be bewildered, and what appears to be "right reason" to one man may appear absurdity to another. What person of much reflection is not aware that there have been changes in his own views as to what "is repugnant to right reason?" If a proposition appears to me "repugnant to right reason," I may not hence infer that it must appear in the same light to my brother who embraces it as a divine truth. This thought however is so far from diminishing, that it enlarges, the ground for Christian candour one towards another.

ing to reason; as if it were a crime to employ that noblest talent with which God has entrusted them, on the most important of all subjects.

"Christianity is a good cause, and will bear any examination: to prevent an examination is to betray, and not to defend it. Leave the gospel with every man to examine: the excellency of its doctrines will defend it. It is to be trusted with the laity, as well as clergy; for it makes no distinction between them. Every one may understand the most necessary parts of it; they want neither popes nor councils to explain them.

It requires no artifice to support it: no false miracles: no ancient opinion or practice, either of fathers or saints; whether they were learned, able, and honest, or whether they were weak, credulous and designing men. Nor can any human authority, though dignified with the name of primitive, add the least weight to it. We ought not to trust to authority, but appeal to reason in defence of Christianity; and begin by convincing men, instead of scattering terrors, which no wise man will regard. It was monstrous to believe, or to endeavour to persuade others, that any one would be damned for a mistake in judgement or opinion. What an unworthy notion must he have of the Deity who holds such a tenet! Instead of condemning his neighbour for no crime, he should ask pardon of God for his own impiety."

THE SUBSTANCE OF SEVERAL LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE
REV. DR. EMMONS, CONTAINING REMARKS ON HIS CONVEN-
TION SERMON.

THE letters to Dr. Emmons, the substance of which is now to be exhibited, were written soon after his Convention Sermon was published. They were intended for the press, in a separate pamphlet, and were submitted to the inspection of the Doctor, and several of his friends in 1808. For some reasons, which were of weight in the mind of the writer, the publication was deferred. But those reasons no longer operate; and being conscious that the letters were written with feelings of respect and friendship towards the author of the sermon,—and believing that the influence of the sermon continues to be injurious, the writer of the letters has consented to give an abridgement of his remarks in the *Christian Disciple*. It is his hope that they may be the means of light, love and peace among Christians, and not the means of alienation and strife.

When the manuscript was put into the hands of the Doctor, he was requested to point out whatever he might regard as a misrepresentation of his meaning, or as unfriendly. He returned the manuscript accompanied with a letter both friendly and respectful, and made no complaint. But should he on seeing the letters in print, feel in any manner injured, and think a vindication of his sentiments necessary, it is presumed that there will be no objection to its appearing in the *Christian Dis-*

ciple, if this should be his choice. The subject is of vast importance, and the advancement of truth, love and harmony, among Christians, is the only object of publishing the letters.

It is indeed a number of years since the sermon was published, and by some it may have been forgotten; but the sentiments it contains have been imbibed and cherished by many, and they are probably the cause of much of that uncharitableness through which the Christian religion is dishonoured by its professed friends.

LETTER I.

REV. SIR,

I HAVE had opportunity to examine your Convention Sermon on "1 Cor. i. 10. Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgement." The sermon displays something of your usual ingenuity, but less correctness than was expected from a writer of your acknowledged discernment. Although I have no doubt of the purity of your intentions, I cannot but question both the justness and the utility of some things which you have stated.

I am, sir, an advocate for that catholicism which will permit me to receive as Christians all who give evidence that they have received Christ, and that

Christ has received them. Among these there are many who dissent from my opinions in some important points, and perhaps not one who agrees with me in every thing which I regard as gospel truth. I am even now about to oppose some opinions which have been advanced by one whom I regard as a Christian brother; and I hope to do this in a manner which shall evince that perfect unity of sentiment is not essential to brotherly love.

In the introductory part of your sermon you say—"The church of Corinth, which Paul planted, abounded in brotherly love, so long as they mutually agreed in believing and professing the peculiar doctrines of the gospel. But when a disagreement in their religious opinions appeared, it destroyed their mutual attachment and involved them in bitter animosities and contentions." This you suppose to have been the occasion of Paul's exhortation in your text.

I have, sir, sought in vain for the source of your information, as to the cause of the contention in the Corinthian church. I see no evidence that the members disagreed about "the peculiar doctrines of the gospel," unless we may suppose that Paul, Apollos, Cephas and Christ were opposed to each other. I have thought with Paul's Continuators "that the divisions among the Corinthians were not in matters of faith, but were occasioned by having men's persons in admiration." If you will examine the context I think you will perceive that Paul was of the same opinion.

If I have not misapprehended your meaning, you regard your text as a command, binding the whole Christian world to be perfectly agreed in all their religious sentiments. Your arguments in support of this opinion will be examined in my next letter.

LETTER II.

The arguments examined.

REV. SIR,

To prove that "the whole Christian world" are required to think alike on all religious subjects, you have stated what you call "two very plain and obvious reasons."

"One reason is, that God has given them an infallible rule of faith."

"In the second place, that the word of God is not only a perfect rule of faith, but sufficiently plain and intelligible to every capacity."

I have brought both your arguments into view together for two reasons :

1. I have no dispute with you, respecting the perfection of the scriptures, as a rule of faith.

2. Because your first argument is of no force unless the second be founded in truth. If the first, by itself, were of any force it would apply to the whole heathen world, as well, as "to the whole Christian world." What I have then to do, is to examine your second argument :—The rule of faith, the word of God, you say "is sufficiently plain and intelligent to every capacity."

I am willing, sir, to admit, that the bible is sufficiently plain and intelligible to answer all the purposes of God in giving

it to the world. But this was not your meaning; for in this view of the matter the argument would afford no support to your theory. Besides, you say, "the bible is the word of God; he gave it to be the rule of faith to all; he knew the characters, the circumstances, and the capacities of all; it must therefore be plain and intelligible to all." You add, "to deny this, is to impeach the wisdom and goodness of God."

Surely, sir, I am not conscious of any disposition "to impeach the wisdom and goodness of God;" yet I cannot but question the conclusiveness of your reasoning. I am sensible that the term *all*, is sometimes used in a very limited sense; and it seems almost incredible that you should, in this argument, have used it in the unlimited or universal sense, when you say the bible must "be plain and intelligible to *all*." Yet you have given me no clue by which I may limit your meaning.

Permit me then to ask, whether you mean to say, that the bible is so plain and intelligible to every child of three or five years old, that he cannot misunderstand it if his heart be good; or that he cannot fail of understanding it correctly, unless it be owing to some criminal bias? If you did not mean to have your *all* comprise children of five years old, I wish you had taken care to fix your limits. For I am free to confess that I know not where to fix them, to have your argument of any force.

In illustrating this argument you have said that "all who are capable of knowing that they are the creatures of God,

are equally capable of knowing what he has required them to believe, concerning himself, and concerning their own character, their present situation and their future state."

There is a sense in which the sentence just quoted is true; because the requirements of God have due respect to the capacity of every subject. But if by this observation you mean, that all who are capable of understanding that they are the creatures of God, are also capable of understanding all the doctrines of the gospel, this is more than I can admit; and I suspect it is more than you, on reflection, will attempt to vindicate. Yet if this were not your meaning, the propriety of the remark, in this connexion, is to me undiscoverable.

Some children of three years old, may give an intelligible answer to this question, *Who made you?* And will you contend that the same children would be capable of understanding what is meant by being *justified by faith without the deeds of the law*, and every other doctrine of the gospel?

You have ventured to say that "the doctrine of God's existing a trinity in unity and the doctrine of the personal union of humanity and divinity in the glorious Emmanuel, are as easy to understand, though not so easy to explain, as any other doctrine in the scripture." I am, however, inclined to think that these doctrines are as difficult to understand as they are to explain, and that, if they were clearly understood, the difficulty of explaining them would not be great.

But if the bible be so "plain and intelligible to every capacity," as you assert, what need of explanations? To read or to hear the word of God, would be all that would be necessary for the information of the lowest capacity. There are, however, some who live in christian countries, who can neither read nor hear; Is the bible intelligible to their capacities?

However well a person may read or hear, he can understand no sentiment contained in the scripture, any farther than he understands the meaning of the words by which it is expressed. Many words are used in various senses in the bible; sometimes they are used in different senses in the same chapter, in the same paragraph, and, perhaps, in the same verse. Metaphors, allusions, and various figures of speech, are abundantly employed in the bible. To understand some passages great labour is necessary in comparing scripture with scripture. In some cases an appeal from our translation to the original is deemed not only proper but necessary. We may add, that the world is filled with controversies; and these are generally managed, on both sides, with so much appearance of truth, that the weak and illiterate, are liable to be either misled or confounded. Besides, children have, for a long time, to depend on their fallible parents and teachers for the meaning of words, and for the meaning of the scriptures.—In a view of these facts can you still say that the bible "is plain and intelligible to every capacity?"

I cannot but believe that, on

due reflection, you will be convinced, that there are cases, in which a person may be excused from blame while among the articles of his faith some things are found, which cannot be supported by a just interpretation of scripture; and that some reasons may be given, why people differ in their religious opinions, aside from the depravity of their hearts.

There was one passage, at least, in the prophesy of Isaiah, which was not perfectly plain to a man of great authority, until it was explained by Philip. Being asked whether he understood what he was reading, he answered "*How can I except some man should guide me?*" And it does not appear that his heart, at that time, was in a state very unfriendly to the truth. In the opinion of Peter, there were some things in Paul's writings which are *hard to be understood*. I wish you, sir, to consider whether Peter's words "*hard to be understood*," express the same idea as "*plain and intelligible to every capacity*" If not, to what cause shall we attribute the difference in sentiment between the Apostle Peter and Dr. Emmons?

But you may ask how, on my theory, can we vindicate the wisdom and goodness of God in giving the bible as a rule of faith? To this inquiry I am free to answer:—

The scriptures are given to men as a rule of faith, only in proportion to their capacities and opportunities to understand them; and no farther are they binding or obligatory on any human being.

If it can be made to appear,

that God requires of every one an understanding and belief of all the "particular truths" which compose the system; I will then grant, that to suppose the rule of faith is not "plain and intelligible to every capacity," must imply an impeachment of the wisdom and goodness of God. But until this be made to appear, I apprehend no danger in denying the correctness of your second "plain reason," and the theory which it was designed to support.

The bible, though a perfect rule of faith, is no more plain and intelligible than some other books on divinity; and I see no reason why a man should be considered as blamable for not understanding all that he reads in the bible, than for not understanding all he reads in your printed sermons. But do you suppose that all you have written "is plain and intelligible to every capacity?" Or, are your writings to be considered as useless to the world unless persons of every capacity can understand every truth which you have published? If not, why may not the bible be considered as a great blessing to the world, although there are millions who have never seen it; and although there are many things in it above the capacity of the weak and unlearned, as well as some things *hard to be understood* by men of the best abilities and best hearts?

Though great and good men, after the most laborious and impartial inquiries, may be in many errors in their interpretations of scripture; and though some may be so situated by incapacity or erroneous instruc-

tion, as to misunderstand even the most essential doctrines of the gospel; these things argue nothing against the value of the bible, or the wisdom and goodness of God in giving a revelation. All his purposes may be accomplished, and every mouth may be stopped. For God's requirements have a proper respect to the capacity and advantages of every intelligent being.

LETTER III.

The reply to the first objection examined.

REV. SIR,

HAVING, as you supposed, established your theory by *two very plain and obvious reasons*; to prepare the way more perfectly for your inferences, you were pleased to turn your attention to some objections.

"The objection, which first occurs to the mind upon this subject," you say, "arises from the great and visible diversity in the intellectual powers and external circumstances of Christians. It is supposed to be *naturally* as well as *morally impossible* that they should all think alike upon religious subjects, as long as this internal, and external difference remains."

You reply as follows:

"The whole force of this objection will vanish if we only consider that unity of sentiment does not require equality of knowledge. Ten, or twenty, or twenty thousand persons may be united in the same sentiment, or the same scheme of sentiments. A pastor and his people may embrace the same religious opinions in general, though as individuals they may possess

very different powers of mind, and very different degrees of mental improvement. A whole denomination of Christians may be united in their distinguishing tenets, though some may be much better able than others to defend their peculiar system of doctrines. It is easy to see how such a unity of sentiment may take place among such a variety of individuals, without an equality of knowledge. For, so far as they all know the same scheme of sentiment, they all agree; and so far as some feel their deficiency in knowledge they do not pretend to judge, and of consequence do not presume to differ."

In reference to this reply I submit to your consideration the following remarks.

1. Unity of sentiment is nothing more nor less than unity of ideas. As far as any two persons possess the same ideas, so far they are united in opinion, and no farther.

2. Our knowledge consists in ideas; and the sum of any person's knowledge can never be greater than the sum of his ideas. Hence

3. *Perfect unity of sentiment must imply equality of knowledge.* Two persons may be agreed in sentiment in some particulars, and yet not be in all respects equal in knowledge. But they cannot be in all respects united in opinion, unless they are in all respects of equal knowledge.

4. All doctrinal propositions may be considered as conclusions drawn from certain premises. Two or more persons may agree in the conclusions, yet not agree in the premises.

On the other hand they may agree in the premises, and disagree in the conclusions. They may also agree in the premises and in the form of words by which a conclusion is expressed, and yet differ in sentiment. For the proposition which expresses the conclusion may be differently understood.

Now a perfect agreement in sentiment respecting any one doctrine would imply a perfect agreement respecting the premises—and respecting the import and extent of the conclusion. For illustration, I will introduce one proposition from the Assembly's Catechism.

"God's works of providence are his most holy, wise and powerful, preserving and governing all his creatures and all their actions."

You may doubtless find your ten, your twenty, and your twenty thousand, your pastor and his parish, and a whole denomination of Christians, all of whom will acknowledge this proposition as an article of faith. But let them all be examined, as individuals, respecting the ground of their belief, or the premises which support the proposition; let them all be examined as to its import and extent, and the mode of divine operation, and you will probably find very few of the whole who perfectly agree respecting that one doctrine.

Suppose a parish in which the pastor and his people are considered of the same religious sentiments; let the views of each be critically and analytically examined; then compare their sentiments together. In one column set down the instan-

ces of agreement, in another the instances of disagreement; and what would be the result? It may be presumed that the instances of agreement would be greatly overbalanced by the instances of disagreement.

You say, "It is easy to see how a unity of sentiment may take place among such a variety of individuals, without an equality of knowledge. For, so far as they all know the same scheme of sentiment, they all agree; and so far as some feel their deficiency in knowledge, they do not pretend to judge, and of consequence do not presume to differ."

It is easy, sir, for a variety of persons to *profess*, and to *think*, that they agree in sentiment, when in fact they do not.

But when you say, "so far as they all know the same scheme of sentiment they all agree," is it not implied that their agreement in sentiment is co-extensive with the equality of their knowledge respecting the same subjects? The following clause in the sentence, however, is truly *remarkable*. "But so far as any feel their deficiency in knowledge, they do not pretend to judge, and consequently do not presume to differ."

Here, sir, permit me to ask, whether two persons may be *agreed* in sentiment while one presumes to judge and the other does not; or while one has a sentiment and the other has not? Is there not as really a difference in this case, as though both were to judge, and judge differently? It is true that there is no *opposition*, and as true that there is no *agreement*.

You have said that we are re-

quired to agree in all the particular truths which compose the system. If so, a man as really breaks the command by having no sentiment, as by having a sentiment which is erroneous.

"So far as some feel their deficiency in knowledge," you say, "they do not pretend to judge." But what will you say of those who do *not* feel their deficiency? This class is neither few nor small; and though many of them are very ignorant, yet they are not the less forward to judge.

Besides, many people, who are not very selfconfident, may think they have obtained a clear understanding of a subject when they have not, and of course cannot suspend an opinion.

But if the scriptures are "plain and intelligible to every capacity," what occasion can there be, in any case, for a suspension of judgement? At any rate, no two persons can be said to be agreed in sentiment, any farther than each has a sentiment, and both the same sentiment. If this be not true, the infant in the cradle may be said to "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and same judgement" with Dr. Emmons: And with the same propriety it may be said, that they both "speak the same things," though one speaks much and the other not at all.

Perhaps you will say, that when you observed, "so far as some feel their deficiency in knowledge, they do not pretend to judge," you meant to be understood, that on some points they do judge, though on others they do not.

I did, sir, suppose this to be your meaning. But you had been stating that "a whole denomination of Christians may be united in their distinguishing tenets." You then proceeded to tell how this might be, notwithstanding the diversity in their knowledge, namely: "So far as they all know the same scheme of sentiment, they all agree; and so far as some feel their deficiency in knowledge they do not pretend to judge, and of consequence do not presume to differ." In this way, according to your account, a whole denomination may be united in their distinguishing tenets. Suppose the distinguishing tenets of a denomination to be ten. Some of the denomination judge respecting every article. A second class so far feel their deficiency as to judge only with respect to five; a third class judge only with respect to one; and a fourth class, having a still greater sense of their deficiency, forbear to judge of any of the articles. Still the whole denomination are united in their distinguishing tenets! Does not this imply that they are united with regard to those articles, on which some presume to judge, and others pretend not to judge? Now, sir, I would ask, whether, according to your views of unity of sentiment, the whole human family might not be "perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgement," respecting *all* religious subjects, should they all so far feel their deficiency as in no case to judge, and of course have no religious opinions? And if the requirement in your text may be satis-

fied by so feeling our deficiency as not to pretend to judge: And if it be, as you suppose, that blame is in all cases attached to error in judgement respecting religious subjects, is there not some inducement for all, but the selfsufficient, to suspend forming any religious sentiment, until they can do it without danger of error?

LETTER IV.

The reply to the second objection examined.

FOR a second objection you observe, that "The wide difference in the education and instruction of Christians is often supposed to be an insuperable bar in the way of their becoming sentimentally united, in their present imperfect state."

It has sometimes appeared to me that this objection was naturally implied in the first; that the difference of education and instruction is included either in the difference of intellectual powers, or in the difference of external circumstances. But as you have made it a distinct objection I shall state your answer.

"There is no doubt but Christians are extremely prone to imbibe and retain the peculiar doctrines, in which they have been early and uniformly instructed. But since they have the word of God in their hands, it is completely in their power, to bring their own opinions, and the opinions of their instructors to an infallible standard, and to decide for themselves what they ought to believe, or to disbelieve. Neither their private nor public teachers can lay them under a natural necessity

of thinking, or reasoning, or believing wrong ; but only throw difficulties in their way of thinking, or reasoning, or believing right. And it is their indispensable duty if they meet with such difficulties to surmount them, and form their religious sentiments according to the holy scriptures, which will necessarily unite them in the truth."

The extensive powers which you have attributed to Christians, in this passage, would almost tempt one to suspect, that you had in view an order of beings but little known in our world. But, supposing that by *Christians* you must mean some of our fellow creatures, I would ask of what age or of what degree of knowledge a person must be to be a Christian. It seems to me that he must be considerably advanced in years, and possessed of a very learned education before it will be "completely in his power," by the help of the bible to correct all the mistakes he may have imbibed by education, or to decide with certainty, in every case, "what he ought to believe, or to disbelieve."

For myself, I am free to own my incompetency for such a task. And as I am confident that your observations are inapplicable to myself, I cannot but entertain a suspicion that they are so to many others.

Notwithstanding all you have said to make it appear that the rule of faith is plain and intelligible to every capacity, I cannot but suspect that your own practice is in direct contradiction to your theory. Do you not explain the scriptures to

your children, to your people, and to your students in divinity ? On what ground do you attempt this ? Is it on the ground that the scriptures are *not* "sufficiently plain and intelligible to every capacity ?" Or, is this done to make the rule of faith *more than sufficiently* plain and intelligible ? Do you mean by this conduct practically to "impeach the wisdom and goodness of God !"

If the scriptures are sufficiently plain and intelligible to every capacity, or if it be "completely in the power of all to bring their own opinions and the opinions of their instructors to an infallible standard, and decide for themselves what they ought to believe or to disbelieve ;" I think your good sense must allow, that it is no part of a minister's duty to *explain* the scriptures, and that to attempt it is preposterous.

The third objection, which you have brought into view, is founded in "the right of private judgement."

I shall remark only on the first sentence of your reply :

"It is readily granted" you say, "that every Christian has a right to think, to read, and to converse upon any religious sentiment, in order to collect evidence of its truth or falsehood, and after that, to judge according to the evidence he has collected."

I would here inquire, whether a person may not think, read and converse in order to collect evidence of the truth or falsehood of a religious sentiment, and yet, in judging honestly, according to the evidence he may have collected, form an errone-

ous opinion? After all his labour he may have obtained but a *part* of the evidence which in fact exists; and that part may have escaped his notice, which was most essential to a correct decision. And if he has a right to judge according to the evidence he has collected, why may he not be said to have a right to form an erroneous opinion? But I should prefer saying, that a person may, in some cases, be under a *necessity* of forming an erroneous opinion, or of neglecting to form any opinion at all. A magistrate, in certain cases, may judge correctly, according to the evidence which he has been able to collect, and yet acquit a man who is really guilty, or condemn one who is innocent.

LETTER V.

Remarks on the reply to the fourth objection.

YOU observe "There is but one other objection which appears to be worthy of notice; and this is drawn from the fourteenth chapter of Romans, in which the Apostle is supposed to *allow* Christians to differ in their religious sentiments, and only exhorts them to view their different opinions with a candid and charitable eye."

As it is quite as important for us to consider what God approves, as what the Apostle allows, I would beg leave to vary the form of the objection, and state it thus:—

"From what Paul wrote to the Corinthians, at Rome, in the fourteenth chapter of his Epistle, it appears, that there are cases, in which real Christians may differ in sentiment and

practice, and yet each may aim at the glory of God, and each obtain his approbation!"

In reply to the objection, as you stated it, you first observe, "This is rather an objection against the Apostle himself, than against the leading sentiment of this discourse; for it supposes, that in writing to the Romans he contradicts what he had written five or six years before to the Corinthians."

But perhaps, sir, the objection is not against the *Apostle*, but only against *your views* of his *meaning*.

To obviate the objection you say, respecting the Apostle, "He was then treating of the ceremonial law, which was abrogated by the gospel. He allows, that real Christians might entertain different opinions concerning Mosaic rites and ceremonies, which were things in their own nature indifferent, and which might be observed, or neglected, under a sense of duty. Accordingly, he forbids them to censure one another on account of such nonessential points of difference, and exhorts them to exercise mutual affection and esteem."

Here I would ask, in what sense were the Mosaic rites things indifferent? I know you have said "*in their own nature indifferent*," but this does not give the necessary information.

Will you, sir, pretend, that from the days of Moses to the coming of Christ, the Mosaic rites were things so indifferent that it was of no consequence whether they were regarded by the Israelites, or disregarded? I presume you will not.

I will ask again—Are those

rites *now* in such a sense indifferent, that, with the light we possess, we may introduce and observe them, and yet be blameless? If any of your brethren in the ministry were *now* to introduce the Mosaic rites, I very much doubt whether you would be heard to apologize for their conduct by saying, those rites are things "in their own nature indifferent."

In what sense, then, were these rites indifferent to the Christians at Rome? Might the same person sometimes disregard them, and, sometimes regard them, without respect to

divine requirement? No. Might a person observe them while his conscience dictated that they ought not to be regarded? No. Might a person treat those rites with neglect or disregard while he verily thought them still in force? No.

Then, in this sense only, were they things indifferent—One person might regard them without sin, another might neglect them without sin; if each, in so doing, loved God with all his own understanding: and each might thus obtain the approbation of him who judgeth righteously.†

THE CHRISTIAN CABINET FOR YOUNG PEOPLE.

No. IV.

Character of James Hay Beattie.

AMONG the various means of improving the minds of young people and giving them a proper direction, there are none more efficacious than good examples. Next to living examples of piety, virtue and active benevolence, we may rank well written biography of amiable and worthy persons, who made it their study and delight to serve their generation by the will of God. We shall now exhibit to young readers the character of a young man, whose example is worthy of imitation. The facts are collected from a valuable work entitled "The Power of Religion on the mind, in retirement, affliction, and at the approach of death; exemplified in the testimonies and experience of persons distinguished by their greatness, learning and virtue—By Lindley Murray."

James Hay Beattie, son of Dr. James Beattie, professor of moral philosophy and logic in the University of Aberdeen, was born in the year 1768, and died at the age of twenty-two. He was remarkable from his childhood both for an amiable disposition and fine genius. His father never had occasion to reprove him but three or four times during the whole of his life; bodily chastisement he never experienced at all.

The first rules of morality taught him by his father were "to speak truth, and keep a secret;" and he was never known to violate either. His whole behaviour at school and at college was exemplary. Before he was nineteen years of age he was appointed assistant professor of moral philosophy and logic; and he performed the duties of his office to great satisfaction.

Piety and meekness were

† The remaining letters may be expected in the next Number.

striking features in his character in childhood and through life. The effect of religion upon his mind was, to make him cheerful, considerate, benevolent, intrepid, humble and happy. He loved the whole human race; he bore a particular love to Christians; and he wished all parties to exercise Christian charity towards each other.

He was almost constantly occupied in discharging the duties of his office, in performing acts of kindness, or in planning works of literature for the benefit of mankind; and there is great reason to believe that had his life been prolonged he would have been eminently useful in the world. But it pleased God to take him to himself in the morning of life. When he saw death approaching he met it with his usual calmness and resignation. When he was thought to be just about to expire he sweetly said, "How pleasant a medicine is Christianity!"

"One day," says his father, "when I was sitting by him, he began to speak in affectionate terms, as he often had done, of what he called my goodness to him. I begged him to drop that subject; and was proceeding to tell him that I had never done any thing for him but what duty required and inclination prompted; and that for the little I had done, his filial piety, and other virtues, were to me more than a sufficient recompense,—when he interrupted me—which he was not apt to do—and, starting up, with inexpressible fervour and solemnity, implored the blessing of

God upon me. His look at that moment, though I shall never forget it, I can describe in no other way than by saying, that it seemed to have in it something more than human, and what I may, not very improperly, perhaps, call angelic. Seeing me agitated he expressed concern for what he had done; and said, whatever might be in his mind, he would not any more put my feelings to so severe a trial. Sometimes, however, warm sentiments of gratitude would break from him: and those were the only occasions on which during the whole course of his illness he was observed to shed tears, till the day before his death, when he desired to see his brother, gave him his blessing, wept over him, and bid him farewell."

At the conclusion of the memoirs of this excellent young man, written by his father, the bereaved parent says—"I have lost the pleasantest, and, for the last four or five years of his short life, one of the most instructive companions, that ever man was delighted with. But the Lord gave; the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord. I adore the Author of all Good, who gave him grace to lead such a life, and die such a death, as makes it impossible for a Christian to doubt of his having entered upon the inheritance of a happy immortality."

Here let our young readers pause, ponder, reflect and resolve. Is it possible for you not to admire the character of James Hay Beattie? If not, let it be your care to live and die like him.

No. V.

Reflections of men of different characters in the prospect of death.

CARDINAL BEAUFORT.—History informs us that he had been accused of poisoning Humphrey, duke of Gloucester; and that he prevailed on the king to grant him letters of pardon for all the offences he had committed. But when he was about to die he thus gave vent to his feelings—"And must I then die? Will not all my riches save me? I could purchase the kingdom if that would prolong my life. What! is there no bribing death? When my nephew the duke of Bedford died, I thought my happiness and my authority greatly increased: but the duke of Gloucester's death raised me in fancy to a level with kings; and I thought of nothing but accumulating still greater wealth, to enable me at length to purchase the triple crown. Alas! how are my hopes disappointed! Wherefore, O my friends! let me earnestly beseech you to pray for me, and recommend my departing soul to God."

SIR THOMAS SMITH.—A short time before his death he was much affected with the prospects before him. He sent for two bishops and entreated them to state from the scriptures "the plainest and surest way of making his peace with God:" adding, "It is a lamentable thing that men consider not for what they are born into the world, till they are ready to go out of it."

CARDINAL RICHELIEU.—A

person who came to see him asked him why he was so sad; he replied, "the soul is a serious thing; it must either be sad here for a moment, or be sad forever."

CESAR BORGIA, was a son of Pope Alexander VI. A short time before his death he said, "I had provided in the course of my life for every thing except death; and now, alas! I am to die, though entirely unprepared."

Let young people beware that they do not imitate such examples, nor expose themselves to such reflections on a dying bed.

JOHN LOCKE. About two months before the death of this celebrated author, he wrote a letter to Anthony Collins, and left this direction upon it "To be delivered to him after my decease." The following is a copy of the letter:—"I know you loved me living, and will preserve my memory when dead. All the use to be made of it is, that this life is a scene of vanity, which soon passes away, and affords no solid satisfaction, but in the consciousness of doing well, and in the hopes of another life. This is what I can say upon experience; and what you will find to be true, when you come to make up the account. Adieu! I leave my best wishes with you."

JOHN LOCKE."

A short time before his decease he said to a friend,—"I am in the sentiments of charity towards all men; and of a sincere union with the church of Christ, under whatever name distinguished."

No. VI.

The benevolent John Howard.

THIS celebrated philanthropist, who devoted his life to the benevolent object of meliorating the condition of those who were confined in prisons, was born in the year 1726. That our young readers may have some correct views of this eminent man, and that they may learn to admire the benefactors of mankind, I shall give them an extract from Mr. Burke's eulogy:—

"I cannot," says Mr. Burke, "name this gentleman without remarking, that his labours and writings have done much to open the eyes and hearts of mankind. He has visited all Europe,—not to survey the sumptuousness of palaces, or the stateliness of temples; not to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, nor to form a scale of the curiosity of modern art; not to collect medals, or collate manuscripts:—but to dive into the depths of dungeons; to plunge into the infection of hospitals; to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain; to take the gage and dimensions of misery, depression and contempt; to re-

member the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken, and compare and collate the distresses of all men in all countries. His plan is original; it is as full of genius as it is of humanity. It was a voyage of discovery; a circumnavigation of charity. Already the benefit of his labour is felt more or less in every country: I hope he will anticipate his final reward, by seeing all its effects fully realized in his own."

Mr. Howard often said that "he had no wish for life but as it gave him the means of relieving his fellow creatures." When he was about to leave England for the last time, a friend expressed his concern at parting with him, from an apprehension that they should never meet again. He cheerfully replied, "We shall soon meet in heaven," and as he rather expected to die of the plague in Egypt, he added "The way to heaven from Grand Cairo is as near as from London." He, however, did not die in Egypt, but at Cherson in Russia. The following lines were written, on the occasion of his death, by Dr. Aikin.

Howard, thy task is done! thy Master calls,
And summons thee from Cherson's distant walls.
"Come, well-approv'd! my faithful servant, come!
No more a wanderer, seek thy destined home,
Long have I mark'd thee with o'er-ruling eye
And sent admiring angels from on high,
To walk the paths of danger by thy side,
From death to shield thee, and through snares to guide.
My minister of good, I've sped thy way,
And shot through dungeon glooms a leading ray,
To cheer, by thee, with kind, unhop'd relief,
My creatures lost and whelm'd in guilt and grief.
I've led thee, ardent, on through wondering climes
To combat human woes and human crimes.

But 'tis enough ! thy great commission's o'er
I prove thy faith, thy love, thy zeal, no more :
Nor droop that far from country, kindred, friends,
Thy life, to duty long devoted, ends.
What boots it where the high reward is given,
Or whence the soul triumphant springs to heav'n ?”

HISTORICAL FRAGMENTS.

CHAP. III.

“MR. HIGGINSON says in his Journal, that he sailed from the Isle of Wight, the 11th of May, (1628) and arrived at Cape-Ann the 27th of June, and at Naumkeag, (Salem) the 29th. They found at Naumkeag about 100 planters, 8 houses, besides a fair house for Mr. Endicot. The old and new planters together were about 300, of which 100 removed to Charlestown, where there was a house built ; the rest remained at Salem.”

“On the 20th of July, Mr. Higginson and Mr. Skelton, after fasting and prayer, were first elected by the company for their ministers, the first teacher, the other pastor, each of them together with three or four grave members, laying their hands on the other with solemn prayer. Nothing is said of any church being then formed ; but on the 6th of August, the day appointed for the choice and ordination of elders and deacons, thirty persons entered into a covenant in writing, which is said to be the beginning of the church, and that the ministers were ordained or instituted anew.”

“Two of the company, John Brown and Samuel Brown, one a lawyer, and the other a merchant, both men of good estates, and of the first patentees and of

the council, were dissatisfied. They did not like that the common prayer and service of the church of England should be wholly laid aside, and therefore drew off, with as many as were of their sentiments, from the rest, and set up a new society. This offended the governor, who caused the two members of his council to be brought before him, and judging that this practice, together with some speeches they had uttered, tended to sedition, he sent them back to England.”—*Hutchinson's History of Mass., Bay vol. i. p. 11, 12.*

In reference to the conduct mentioned in the last paragraph, Mr. Hutchinson quotes from the Spirit of Laws the following remark :—“It is a principle that every religion which is persecuted becomes itself persecuting ; for as soon as by some accidental turn it arises from persecution, it attacks the religion which persecuted it.” There has been too much ground for this remark, but we may hope that it will not always be so.

“The governor and some of the principal persons left Salem the 17th of June and travelled through the woods to Charlestown, about 20 miles, to look out for a convenient place for a chief town. At a point

on Shawmut or Trimontaine, since Boston, lived Mr. Blaxton, who had left England, being dissatisfied there, and not a thorough conformist; but he was more dissatisfied with the non-conformity of the new comers. He told them he came from England because he did not like the Lords Bishops, but he could not join them because he did not like the Lords Brethren. He claimed the whole peninsula upon which Boston is built, because he was the first that slept upon it. He had a grant of a very handsome lot at the west part of the town; but he chose to quit all and removed to the southward, at or near what is since called Providence, where he lived to old age." p. 21.

"The first general court was held the 19th of October, (probably 1630) not by a representative, but by every one that was free of the corporation. One hundred and nine free men were admitted at this court. Maverick, Blackstone, and many more who were not of any of the churches were of this number. The next general court

was the court of elections, for 1631. The scale was now turned and the freemen resolved to choose both governor, deputy and assistants—and made an order that for the time to come none should be admitted to the freedom of the body politic but such as were church members!"

"This," says Mr. Hutchinson, "was a most extraordinary order or law, and yet it continued in force until the dissolution of the government, it being repealed in appearance only after the restoration of Charles II. Had they been deprived of their civil privileges in England by an act of parliament unless they would join in communion with the church there, it might very well have been the first in the roll of grievances. But such were the requisites to qualify for church membership here that the grievance was abundantly greater."—p. 25, 26.

What would be thought at this day of an attempt to exclude all from the privileges of freemen except church members?

INQUIRIES RELATING TO 1 JOHN V. 16, AND MATT. XXI. 22.

To the Editor of the Christian Disciple.

SIR,

I HAVE lately read an illustration of the 16th verse of the 5th chapter of the First Epistle of John. It is a passage which has long perplexed my mind, as many others have done—particularly Matt. xxi. 22—*And all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive*—together with its parallel passage. Are not these special

promises to the Apostles and those who were empowered to work miracles in confirmation of the testimony they bore to Christ and his gospel?

These special gifts were not, I humbly conceive, permanent in the Apostles, but granted on special occasions and in answer to prayer. Were not these prayers offered by an immediate impulse of the holy spirit, where-

by they knew it was a proper occasion for God to manifest his power by them, in confirmation of their testimony. We find they had power to do good by healing the sick, and also to inflict judicial punishments on special occasions. An awful instance of this is that of Ananias and Sapphira his wife, by Peter, and that of Elymas the sorcerer by Paul. Had the power been permanent in the Apostles it would have required a continual miracle to keep them from an abuse of it. The gift of tongues I conceive was permanent in those who received it in the church of Corinth, and was shamefully abused. In this church we read that many were weak and sickly as a judicial punishment for their irregularities. May we not un-

derstand the words of John as having immediate reference to those special promises made to the Apostles who were empowered to work miracles in confirmation of the testimony they bore to Christ and his gospel?

In the preceding verses we read thus—"This is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will he heareth us; and if we know that he heareth us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petition that we desired of him." When it was necessary for the Apostles to show their commission for preaching Christ and him crucified, they showed it by working a miracle. God set this great seal of heaven to the doctrine they preached. J. T.

POETRY.

DIRGE—To be sung by a choir of Singers on the death of a member.

We mourn a member of our train,
And now the funeral dirge begin,
And seek in music's soothing strain
A respite from our grief to win.

Soft be the notes from friendship due
To one whose voice attun'd with
ours,
Once would the theme of praise pursue,
With harmony's delightful powers.

But solemn be the lay and slow
When of that friend's decease we
tell;
For ah! it breathes the tones of woe
So soon to bid a long farewell.

Farewell! but we shall meet again
In choirs above, and anthems raise
In symphonies of heavenly strain,
And chorus of unending praise.*

* This article has been for some months mislaid.

Vol. V.—No. 10.

ON THE DEATH OF MR. THOMAS
M'GULLOCH.

I SAW the tears fast drop from learning's eye,
As if some favourite son had fled
her bowers,
Who with unwearied toil, and motive
high,
Had pluck'd her richest fruits, and
fairest flowers,
And brought the weightiest treasures
from her mine,
To go and lay them down at virtue's
shrine.

Friendship I saw, o'erwhelm'd with
grief's dark storm,
Start, as if half herself were torn
away,
Frantic, she grasp'd a fair, yet drooping
form,
And still would grasp it, when it
turn'd to clay.

And still in busy sorrow would she fill
Her urn with that dear dust, and bless
it still.

I saw the dew of woe on virtue's
cheek,
That seem'd to mourn some child of
worth and truth,
Pure, simple, manly, unaffected,
meek,
With all the glow—without th' excess
of youth—
The pure exemplar—and the rival
mild—
The tender brother, and the duteous
child.

"Oh!" there I cried, "what mean
those looks of wo?
Why, friendship, learning, virtue,
why your tears?
Oh say what fatal and unusual blow
Has dash'd the hope of youth, the
prop of years?
Full sad and meaning was the glance
they gave,
Which mutely pointed to M'Culloch's
grave.

Gazette.

ON READING THE FOLLOWING STANZA IN A RECENT PRODUCTION OF LORD BYRON.

"THE keenest pangs the wretched find,
Are rapture to the dreary void—
The leafless desert of the mind—
The waste of feelings unemploy'd."

AND dost thou find unhappy bard!
The path thou treadst, to be thus
hard.
And doth thy high and soaring mind
By genius fir'd, by art refin'd;
Thy mind too proud to bow to heav'n,
Too proud to own thy talents giv'n;
Ah! dost thou find this "dreary
void,"
This "waste of feelings unemploy'd?"
Go ask the lowliest mind by faith inspir'd,
Tho' far remov'd from all by thee admir'd.

Of Grecian scenes—of ancient lore—
Parnassus' mount—or Ilion's shore,
He'll tell thee nought,
But brighter scenes than these e'er
knew,
Are present to his chasten'd view,
Employ his ev'ry thought.
The dreary void which thou bewails,
His tranquil mind it ne'er assails.

He finds his God, his truest friend—
He finds in humble fervent pray'r,
A joy thou cannot, will not share,
A foretaste e'en of joys that never
end.

Mistake me not, illustrious bard,
At humble distance I regard
Thine amplest stores of treasur'd
thought.
From learning's paths—from classic
lore,
Parnassus' height, or Grecian shore,
E'en with a wish, I'd drive thee not.

But man, frail man, his God apart,
Howe'er with brightest talents
grac'd,
Is like that fair fall'n Greece thou
trac'd
In lines that touch the feeling heart—
Such as thou paints th' aspect of
that shore—
"Tis Greece," thou sayst, "but
living Greece no more—
"So coldly sweet—so deadly fair—
"We start—for soul is wanting
there."

Leave then, O Bard! thy cheerless
Atheist plan,
Unite the Christian to the accomplish'd
man;
And thus perfection's goal attain,
As far as man that goal can gain;
So wilt thou cease to feel that "void,"
That "waste of feelings unemploy'd."

From a Friend.

INTELLIGENCE.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE
MASSACHUSETTS PEACE SOCIETY
AND THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA
AND PRINCE GALLITZIN.*From the Corresponding Secretary to
the Emperor.*

Brighton, (near Boston,) April 9, 1817.

SIR,

THE friendly disposition which you have manifested in favour of the Christian religion and the peace of the world, has encouraged this address. The very week in which the Holy League of the three sovereigns was officially announced in Russia, a society was formed in Boston, by the name of the Massachusetts Peace Society,—the object of which is to disseminate the very principles avowed in the wonderful alliance, and to do whatever may lawfully be done to prevent the recurrence of war, and to promote peace on earth and good will among men.

I take the liberty to present a copy of all the publications which have been circulated by the society. From these you may obtain information of the state of the society, the number of its members at the close of the first year, and its prospects. The first Annual Report, and the list of officers and members, are contained in the seventh Number of the Friend of Peace. Many members have since been added—a new society has been formed in the state of New-York. At least four Peace Societies have been organized in the United States,—others are about forming. Besides these, we have in our country nearly one thousand congregations of Friends or Quakers, which we regard as so many Peace Societies by profession and practice.

The pamphlets your Majesty will be pleased to accept, as a token of the veneration and esteem in which your character is held by the friends of peace in this country.

In behalf of the Massachusetts Peace Society.

NOAH WORCESTER, *Cor Sec.*
His Majesty, Alexander, }
Emperor of all the Russias }

The Emperor's Answer.

SIR,

YOUR letter in behalf of the Massachusetts Peace Society, with the books accompanying it, were received. The object which this Philanthropic Institution has in view, the dissemination of the principles of peace and amity among men, meets with my cordial approbation. My endeavours to promote peace and good will among the nations are already known; and the power and influence which Almighty God has committed to me, shall ever be employed, I trust, in striving to secure to the nations the blessings of that peace which they now enjoy.

Considering the object of your society, the promotion of peace among mankind, as one so eminently congenial to the spirit of the gospel of Jesus Christ, I have judged it proper to express these my sentiments respecting your labours, in answer to your communication to me on this subject.

ALEXANDER.

To the Rev. Noah Worcester, }
Secretary of the M. P. S. }
St. Petersburg, July 4, 1817.

Letter to Prince Gallitzin.

Brighton, (near Boston,) April 9, 1817.

SIR,

YOUR name is known and revered in America as the President of the Russian Bible Society. The confidence which your excellent official letters have inspired, induces me to send for your perusal all the publications which have been circulated by the Massachusetts Peace Society. Similar copies will accompany these for your worthy Emperor. The noble ground which he has taken in the Holy League has greatly encouraged the hearts of the friends of peace in this country. As the pamphlets will give you information of the prospects of the Peace Society, I shall only express the hope which is entertained, that your name will be enrolled among the avowed friends of peace, and there shine with as great lustre as it has done

among the Presidents of National Bible Societies.

NOAH WORCESTER,

Cor. Sec. M. P. S.

His Excel. Prince Alexander Gallitzin.

Answer of Prince Gallitzin.

SIR,

I RECEIVED your letter of the 9th April with the Numbers of the Friend of Peace accompanying it, by the hands of Mr. Parsons; for which I return you my hearty thanks. The object, which your society has in view, is of great importance to the well-being and happiness of the human race. Indeed, it seems to me to be almost the same as that of Bible Societies; for it is only in proportion as the divine and peaceable principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ prevail in the hearts of men, that lasting and universal peace can be expected. A blessed period is promised in the word of God, when men shall learn the art of war no more. This period I understand to be the same as that in which, it is prophesied, that all men shall know the Lord, even from the least unto the greatest, and that the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord. These latter promises seem to be daily fulfilling, in every quarter of the world, by the exertion of Bible and other Christian Societies, to disseminate among men the saving and pacific principles of Jesus Christ. They are preparing the way for your society's gaining its object—peace—universal peace—when men shall learn the art of war no more. Most earnestly praying for every blessing to accompany your labour, in promoting peace on earth and good will among men, I shall reckon it a peculiar honour to be among the members of such a humane society. I remain, sir, your most obedient servant.

PRINCE ALEX. GALLITZIN.

To the Rev. Noah Worcester, }

Sec. of the Mass Peace So. }

St. Petersburg, July 4, 1817.

At a meeting of the Trustees of the Massachusetts Peace Society. September 25th, the foregoing correspondence was communicated, and by them ordered to be published. If the Editors of news-papers shall see fit to republish it, the officers of the Peace

Society will be gratified, and, it is hoped, that the cause of peace will be promoted.

LETTER FROM MR. ROBERT PINKERTON.

St. Petersburg, July 5, (O.S.) 1817:

DEAR SIR,

WITH much satisfaction I have read of the labours of the Peace Society in Boston to farther the best interests of the human race; and as Mr. Parsons is just setting off, I embrace the opportunity of sending you the last Report of the Russian Bible Society, whose progress will afford you and all the friends of the kingdom of Jesus Christ real pleasure. I remain, dear sir, your very humble servant.

ROBERT PINKERTON.

The Rev. Noah Worcester.

The Report of the Russian Bible Society is published in the German language. We hope, however, that some part of it may be translated for the next Number of the Disciple. A concise account of the meeting of the Russian Bible Society and of the Report was published in French in the Court Gazette of St. Petersburg. By the favour of Mr. Theophilus Parsons, mentioned in the letters from Russia, we have obtained a copy of the Gazette and the following translation.

Annual Meeting of the Russian Bible Society.

LE CONSERVATEUR IMPARTIAL.

(The Court Gazette.)

St. Petersburg, June 13th, (N. S.)

May 31st, (Old Style.)

SATURDAY, the 26th, at 11 o'clock. A. M. the Russian Bible Society held its fourth general meeting at the Faubourg Palace, Prince Alexander Gallitzin, opened the meeting by a very eloquent discourse in which His Excellency directed the attention of his auditors to the rapid progress of the word of God in the interior of the empire and elsewhere,—he reminded them of the unappreciable benefits which the Emperor never ceases to shower upon the society, and observed upon the general and spontaneous disposition which every one evinced to co-operate in a work so salutary and consoling; His Excellency concluded

by remarking how vain were the efforts of those who would put limits to the rapid course of this vivifying water, and who do not recognize the hand of him who has given the divine word.

Monsieur the actual counsellor of of state Popoff, secretary, read the report, of which, the result is as follows :—

In 1813, 14, and 15, the voluntary contributions amounted to 412,277 rubles.

In 1816, to 167,818 rubles 86 copeks. The money received to print the holy scriptures in 1813, 14, and 15, produced 45,223 rubles, 46 copeks, and in 1816, 30,160 rubles, 84 copeks.

In 1813, 14, and 15, have been sold and distributed 19,915 copies, and in 1816, 19,431 copies.

The expense of the three first years has amounted to 297,642 rubles, 47 copeks, and in 1816, to 227,770 rubles, 73 copeks.

There is now remaining in the treasury for the current year the sum of 130,027 rubles, 31 copeks. Since the establishment of the society there have been printed and are now printing 43 editions in 17 different languages, 196,000 copies.

Afterwards, Monsieur Tourgueneeff, the actual counsellor of state, second secretary, read an interesting exposé upon the progress of the foreign Bible Societies in the different parts of the world ; the extract from it follows :

In the British possessions, there have been formed 558 principal and affiliated societies : 1,728,635 copies of the bible have been printed in 66 different languages. The expences amounted to more than 10 millions of rubles ; last year's expense to more than 3 millions.

In Germany within the space of a year, there have been established Bible Societies at Brunswick, Osnabruck, Königsfeld, Nassau-Hombourg, Frankfort, Neuwied, Eisenach, and in many other places. The influence of these societies extends itself not only upon the Protestants but also upon the Catholics, for whom there have been published at Marbourg, Ratisbon, and Munich, three translations of the scriptures to the number of 120,000 copies ; and in the low countries, the society of Amsterdam,

under the immediate protection of His Royal Highness the Prince of Orange, reckons already 60 affiliated societies. In Sweden and Denmark, besides the existing societies, others have been opened within the present year. In Asia, the societies of Calcutta, Bombay, Columbo, Batavia, Amboyn, and elsewhere, occupy themselves particularly with the translation of the Bible into the different dialects of the country. The zeal of the Missionaries of Serampore has been very remarkable in translating the scriptures into 28 different languages. Three editions of the New Testament translated into Chinese by Mr. Morrison, have been already printed. In Africa, besides the societies which existed in the isles of Maurice, Bourbon, St. Helena, Caledonia, another has been formed at Sierra Leone, from which that at London, has received £150 sterling, a part of which was given by the negroes.

In America have been established more than 150 societies, 13 of them by ladies. Christophe and Petion ask for St. Domingo, the scriptures in French and English. The Esquimaux possess the gospel in their own language. Jamaica and Antigua have also Bible Societies. Although we have not yet the complete list of all the existing Bible Societies, they may be reckoned at about 1000, of which more than 700 are in Europe, and more than 200 in the other parts of the world.

The assembly composed of the clergy of the first rank of the Greek ritual—of His Eminence the metropolitan of the Latin ritual—the pastors of the Protestant church, and a great number of persons of distinction, was terminated by reading the list of the Vice-Presidents, Directors, and Secretaries of the society.

EXTRACT FROM DR. MASON'S SPEECH
BEFORE THE LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

“PERMIT me to press upon the minds of this Christian audience, one of the singular, original honours of this Institution. I believe, sir, it was in the bosom of the London Missionary Society that the gospel spirit of Catholic love and fellowship originat-

ed. If my memory does not deceive me, till that period, Christians were looking at their different peculiarities through a very thick mist. And we all know what a fog is : every man knows that if he see an object through a mist it has a vast and imposing appearance ; but when he comes up to it, it dwindles into nothing. The light and warmth issuing from this society have driven away this mist ; and Christians that were jangling about a variety of little things have found that they were not worth the pains and trouble. They have discovered, with great surprise, that they are practically one in Christ Jesus. Out of that Catholic spirit of gospel benevolence that unites believers to the Son of God, whatever be their external forms, have proceeded unquestionably, in a very great degree, all the other forms of noble munificence in this country. Had there been no Missionary Society, there would have been no British and Foreign Bible Society ; and I cannot help marking with particular care and tender feeling the march of the Divine Providence."

These are noble sentiments ; and they are the more remarkable as coming from Dr. Mason. If he has become duly aware of the pernicious influence of that "thick mist" through which Christians of different names have seen each others characters and sentiments ; we may hope that the liberal views which he has expressed at London, will be retained by him till he returns to this country,—and that he will be an instrument of dispelling the fog which has occasioned such unchristian animosity in New-York as well as in other places.

LONGEVITY IN THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

In the *Philanthropist* for April, 1815, we have an article entitled *Hints for improving the condition of the poor*, in which we have the following observations :—

"In the course of their speculations some of our philanthropists have noticed, with admiration not unmixed with surprise, the competence enjoyed by the lower orders of the Society of Friends. Finding that the poor of this persuasion are maintained exclu-

sively by contributions raised within the society, and that the indigent members are comparatively few ; these benevolent writers have been ready to suspect the existence of some valuable nostrum, some secret cause of so strange a phenomenon. The following facts were collected for the purpose of elucidating this difficulty, and at the same time of illustrating those general principles by which alone one of the most difficult and important of all political problems can be solved."

The writer then exhibits, from the Register of the Society of Friends and from bills of mortality, several tables, shewing the probabilities of life among the members of this society ; these he compares with other tables, and bills, and makes out the following result :—In the counties of Surrey and Sussex, half the number born of the Society of Friends live to 57 years of age : In Bristol, half the born live to 43 years : In London and Middlesex, to 40 years.

According to the accounts of Dr. Price, half the born live in London 2 years and 9 months—In the Pays de Vaud to 41 years—In a Country Parish in Brandenburg to 25½—In the parish of Holy Cross near Shrewsbury to 27—In Vienna to 2—In Berlin to 2 1-2 years.

By the tables relating to the Friends it appears that in Surrey and Sussex 1 in 8 1-2 or 2 in 17 live to 80 years of age—In Bristol 1 in 9—In London and Middlesex 1 in 13 1-2 or 2 in 27. The accounts of Dr. Price give 1 in 40 for London—1 in 41 for Vienna,—and 1 in 37 for Berlin, who live to that age.

The writer further inquires relating to the number of births and marriages in the Society of Friends compared with the community at large, and says : "To sum up the whole it appears then that fewer deaths take place in infancy among the members of this society than among other persons,—that their superior longevity is not accompanied by any rapid increase of numbers,—that the number of persons in the helpless state of infancy must therefore be peculiarly small,—that this satisfactorily accounts for the greater degree of competence which they enjoy—and lastly, that such a state of things does of necessity imply

a smaller proportion of births and of marriages than among the community at large.

"Why the proportion of marriages among persons of this persuasion should be smaller must be left to every one to explain in his own way. I shall only mention *one* cause—The children of members of this society generally have for many years past received a thoroughly good education, not grudgingly confined to reading the bible although they value it beyond every other book, but comprehending writing, arithmetic, English grammar, and the elements of geography and mathematics."

To this account from Great Britain we have to add one of a still more extraordinary character, which has recently appeared in the News-papers in our own country. An article has been copied into the Boston Recorder for Sept. 9, from the National Intelligencer, entitled "Advantage of Temperance," the substance of which is from a Newport paper of February 12, giving the bill of mortality in the Monthly Meeting of Friends in that place.

The Meeting is said to comprise above 400 persons. The number of deaths in *five* years is but 31, and in that period not one person has died of that society under 48 years of age! The ages of the 31 persons who have died averaged 74. In 1812, eight persons died, the youngest of which was 60 years of age—the oldest 84—of this age there were two. In 1813, also eight died—the youngest 49—the oldest 85. In 1814, but one died, this aged 87. In 1815, five died, the youngest 48, the oldest 90. In 1816, nine died, the youngest 57—the oldest 94.

In view of this extraordinary account the National Intelligencer asks, "To what shall be attributed the full exemption from death of all the young, but the healthy constitutions of the parents? Or to what the almost regular longevity of adults but to habits of regular temperance?"

It may be doubted whether any other society in this country can furnish a table of longevity, or a bill of mortality for 5 years, so extraordinary as the account from Newport. If this and the account of the Friends in

England are correct, and if the facts are to be ascribed to temperance and regular habits, it is much to the honour of the society; and if long life be desirable there is great inducement for other people to imitate the Friends in respect to their moral habits. It is not to be questioned that a very great number of people in our country shorten their lives by intemperance; and that many of those who die in infancy and childhood fall a prey to the diseases entailed upon them by the vices of their parents. Let parents then who have formed or who are forming vicious habits, seriously consider, how they will be able to answer at the bar of God for thus sacrificing their own lives and the lives of their children to gratify their appetites. Are the lives of your offspring of so little value that you may lawfully give them in exchange for inebriating liquors or the pleasures of intemperance!

GREAT FAMINE IN SAXONY, GERMANY.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Rosswein, near Dresden, in Saxony, to his son in Harrisburg, dated May 31, 1817.

"SCARCITY and Famine have dreadfully increased since my last letter of April 16, of this year. In many places unnatural means are used for the maintenance of the human species, such as in common times are hardly offered to beasts; among other articles, bread is baked of potatoe peelings, bran, and straw of oats, and even of that there is great want. The straw gets ground but contains very little nourishment. I enclose a sample of it. The people would cheerfully work, but cannot find employ; manufacturers in particular are unable to furnish any, and the alms which are given do not suffice. The prospects for the next harvest are also not good, as the grain stands very thin, because a great deal of it has not come up, owing to the two wet seasons which we have had in succession, by which the grain was injured in the blossom, and almost all harvested in a wet state. We must, alas! apprehend, therefore, that this famine will continue during the next winter.

"The present scarcity is far more

oppressive than the former, as there has been little trade for many years, in consequence of which people have not been able to lay up any thing, and therefore are compelled to pawn or sell for a trifle what they have left."

ORDINATIONS AND INSTALLATIONS.

IN Park-street, Boston, September 3, Rev. Sereno E. Dwight—Introductory prayer by Rev. N. W. Taylor of New-Haven; sermon by Rev. Lyman Beecher, of Litchfield, Conn. from Psalm xix. 7-10; consecrating prayer by Rev. Dr. Dana, of Newburyport; charge by Rev. Dr. Spring; right-hand by Rev. J. Huntington, Boston.

On the same day and in the same place, E. P. Swift, Allen Graves, John Nichols, Levi Parsons and Daniel Buttrick, were ordained as Missionaries to the Heathen. The consecrating prayer by Rev. Dr. Worcester, of Salem; charge by Rev. Dr. Morse, of Charlestown; right-hand by Rev. J. Bates, of Dedham, Rev. M. Gile, of Milton, Rev. J. Codman, of Dorchester, Rev. J. Huntington, of Boston, and Rev. Richard S. Storer, of Braintree—the address being delivered by Rev. Mr. Bates.

Sept. 11. Rev. Isaac Hurd was installed as pastor of the New Church in Exeter, N. H. The services were performed in the usual order by the following ministers, Rev. A. Abbot, of Beverly; Rev. Dr. Dana, of Newburyport; Rev. Mr. Holt, of Epping; Rev. Mr. Porter, of Rye; Rev. F. Parkman, of Boston, and Rev. Mr. Nichols, of Portland.

Rev. Ira Chase was ordained at Danvers Sept. 17, by the Baptist Association.

Rev. James Colman and Rev. Edward W. Wheelock, were ordained Sept. 10, as Missionaries, at the Meeting-House of Rev. Dr. Baldwin, Boston.

OBITUARY.

Died in England, Hugh Percy, Duke of Northumberland.

In Paris, M. Suard, Secretary of the French Academy, aged 85.

In Ireland, R. L. Edgeworth, Esq. author of many literary works—74.

In Hamburg, Professor E. D. Ebeling—76.

In Germany, Werner, the great mineralogist.

In Hartford, Con. Rev. David Bacon, aged 46.

In Stoneham, Mrs. Sarah, wife of Rev. J. H. Stevens—50.

In Lynnfield, Mrs. Sarah Tarbell—94. Her husband died aged 96—they lived in a married state more than 70 years.

In Rumney, N. H. widow Abigail Craig—104.

In Cambridge, Mr. Thomas M'Culloch, of the senior class in Harvard University—21. Also, Edward Canfield, of the junior class—20.

In Rome, Mass. Mr. J. Dodge—101.

In Portland, Brig. Gen. T. Osgood—40.

In South Carolina, Gen. Pickens.

In Georgia, Hon. Peter Early, late governor of the state.

At Westport, Paul Cuffee—58.

In Boston, Mr. William Breed—67.

Capt. Nathan. Thayer, merchant—66.

Mr. Joseph Blake—77.

Hon. B. Hichborn—72.

In Amesbury, the wife of Rev. Mr. Sawyer.

In Ipswich, John D. Andrews, Esq.—27.

In Cambridge, Mrs. E. A. Willard, wife of Professor Willard—28.

In Shrewsbury, Dr. Silas Wheelock—48.

In Bristol, Mrs. Elizabeth, wife of Bishop Griswold.

Letters from New-Orleans state that sickness prevails in that place—that from 20 to 30 persons died daily.

In Carolina County, Virginia, Aug. 22d, Mr. James Bowie was murdered by his negro man Reuben, and his body thrown into the Mill Pond. His head was completely marshed to pieces with a large club. Reuben has escaped.

Candidates for the Ministry.

Mr. Thomas Tracy, Cambridge.

" Jonathan P. Dabney, do.

" Samuel Gilman, do.

" Thomas Savage, do.

" P. Osgood, do.

" Alvan Lamson, do.

" James Walker, do.